

REMARKS

Claims 1-16 are pending in the present application. New claims 17- 21 are added above. Claims 1, 8, and 13 are amended above. No new matter is added by the claim amendments or new claims. Entry is respectfully requested.

The Applicants note that the Office Action Summary does not indicate whether the drawings filed in the application are acceptable. Confirmation of their acceptability is respectfully requested.

The Applicants further note that the Office Action Summary does not acknowledge the claim for foreign priority in the application and does not indicate whether a certified copy of the priority document has been received. Acknowledgment is respectfully requested.

The Applicants also note with appreciation that the Office Action indicates at page 4, first paragraph that independent claim 16 is allowed.

The Applicants also note with appreciation that the Office Action indicates at page 3, section 3, that claims 6, 7, 9, 14, and 15 would be allowable if written in independent form. New independent claim 17 includes the limitations of original claims 1 and 6. New independent claim 18 includes the limitations of original claims 1 and 7. New independent claim 19 includes the limitations of original claims 8 and 9. New independent claim 20 includes the limitations of original claims 13 and 14. New dependent claim 21 includes the limitations of original claim 15. Entry and allowance of the new claims 17-21 are respectfully requested.

Claims 1-5, 8, and 10-13 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Selinko (U.S. Patent No. 4,437,718) in view of Dube, *et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 4,750,890 - hereinafter "Dube"). Reconsideration and removal of the rejections are respectfully requested.

In the present invention as claimed in independent claim 1, a "guide block" is provided in a "terminal region of a test board." The "guide block" defines an area "into which an integrated circuit can be inserted opposite terminals formed on an upper surface of the test board in the terminal region." A "pressurizing plate" includes a "pressurizing protrusion on a surface thereof" such that "when the pressurizing plate is applied to the guide block, the respective leads of the integrated circuit are urged to directly connect with the corresponding terminals of the upper surface of the test board."

In the present invention as claimed in independent claim 8, an "upper surface" of a terminal region" has "terminals formed thereon." A "guide block" is provided in the main body that defines an area "into which an integrated circuit can be inserted opposite the terminals in the terminal region." A "first pressurizing plate" includes a "pressurizing protrusion on a surface thereof" such that "when the first pressurizing plate is applied to the at least one of the main body and the guide block, the integrated circuit abuts the test board and the respective leads of the integrated circuit are urged to directly connect with the corresponding terminals of the upper surface of the test board."

In the present invention as claimed in independent claim 13, an integrated circuit includes "a guide member in the shape of a vertical protrusion or flute" that is "adapted to mate with the vertical flute or protrusion of the inner surface of the guide block, for aligning the integrated circuit relative to the guide block."

Selinko discloses a stackable integrated chip carrier assembly 100 that is mounted on a printed circuit board 10 (see Selinko, FIG. 1 and column 3, lines 36-41). The chip carrier package 100 includes an overfitting protective outer shield 20 which fastens to the printed circuit board 10 (see Selinko, FIG. 1 and column 3, lines 43-46). Within the protective shield 20 is a plurality of primary spacer members 30, each of which has a central cavity, into which is placed an integrated circuit device 50 having a plurality of electrical leads 55 (see Selinko, FIG. 3 and column 3, lines 46-49). Each spacer member 30 has elongated slots 62, each slot including a

plurality of rectangular recesses 57 (see Selinko, FIG. 3 and column 4, lines 24-31). A top surface of the spacer member 30 permit the electrical leads 55 extending the integrated circuit 50 to rest securely in the corresponding rectangular recesses 57 (see Selinko, FIG. 3 and column 4, lines 34-36). To allow interconnections to occur, a plurality of conductive interconnecting bars 60 are captivated within each elongated slot 62 which make electrical contact with the electrical leads 55 (see Selinko, FIG. 4 and column 4, lines 37-42).

With regard to independent claims 1 and 8, it is submitted that Selinko fails to teach or suggest a “a pressurizing plate” (claim 1) or a “first pressurizing plate” (claim 8) including a “pressurizing protrusion on a surface thereof,” such that when the “pressurizing plate” (claim 1) or “first pressurizing plate” (claim 8) is applied to the “guide block” (claim 1) or “at least one of the main body and the guide block” (claim 8), the “respective leads of the integrated circuit are urged to directly connect with the corresponding terminals of the upper surface of the test board,” as claimed in independent claims 1 and 8. There is no teaching or suggestion in Selinko that the protective shield 20 includes a “pressurizing protrusion.” Moreover, there is no mention in Selinko that the “respective leads of the integrated circuit are urged to directly connect with the corresponding terminals of the upper surface of the test board,” as claimed. Instead, the integrated circuit 50 of Selinko comprises electrical leads 55 that rest securely in the corresponding rectangular recesses 57 of a spacer member 30. In this manner, the conductive interconnecting bars 60 provide an electrical connection between the electrical leads 55 and the terminals 12 (see Selinko, FIG. 2). Thus, there is no direct connection between the electrical leads 55 and the terminals 12 of Selinko.

With regard to independent claim 13, it is submitted that Selinko fails to teach or suggest an “integrated circuit” that comprises a “guide member in the shape of a vertical protrusion or flute adapted to mate with the vertical flute or protrusion of the inner side wall of the guide block,” as claimed in independent claim 13. While Selinko teaches an integrated circuit 50 having electrical leads 55 that rest securely in corresponding rectangular recesses 57, there is no mention in Selinko that the integrated circuit 50 comprises a “guide member in the shape of a

vertical protrusion or flute.” In addition, there is no mention in Selinko of an “inner side wall of the guide block” having a “vertical flute or protrusion,” as claimed in amended independent claim 13.

Dube is cited in the Office Action at page 3, lines 11-15, as disclosing an adapter test socket 10. In Dube, the test socket 10 comprises a body member 13 which includes a plurality of vertically extending apertures 14 (see Dube, FIG. 1 and column 3, line 66 - column 4, line 1). An integrated circuit package 11 having a plurality of terminals 12 is placed on the body member 13 of the test socket 10 (see Dube, FIG. 1). The body member 13 includes apertures 14 for receiving electrical contact portions 17 of contacts 15, 16, whereby the contact portions 17 contact the terminals 12 (see Dube, FIG. 4 and column 3, line 67 - column 4, line 9).

With regard to independent claims 1 and 8, it is submitted that Dube, like Selinko, fails to teach or suggest a “pressurizing plate” (claim 1) or a “first pressurizing plate” (claim 8) including a “pressurizing protrusion on a surface thereof,” such that when the “pressurizing plate” (claim 1) or “first pressurizing plate” (claim 8) is applied to the “guide block” (claim 1) or “at least one of the main body and the guide block” (claim 8), the “respective leads of the integrated circuit are urged to directly connect with the corresponding terminals of the upper surface of the test board,” as claimed in independent claims 1 and 8. There is mention in Dube of a “pressurizing protrusion.” Moreover, there is no mention in Dube that the “respective leads of the integrated circuit are urged to directly connect with the corresponding terminals of the upper surface of the test board,” as claimed in amended independent claims 1 and 8.

With regard to independent claim 13, it is submitted that Dube, like Selinko, fails to teach or suggest an “integrated circuit” that comprises a “guide member in the shape of a vertical protrusion or flute adapted to mate with the vertical flute or protrusion of the inner side wall of the guide block,” as claimed in independent claim 13. There is no mention in Dube of a “guide member in the shape of a vertical protrusion or flute.” In addition, there is no mention in Dube of an “inner side wall of the guide block” having a “vertical flute or protrusion,” as claimed in

amended independent claim 13.

It is therefore submitted that neither Selinko nor Dube teaches or suggests the elements set forth in the amended claims. Specifically, neither Selinko nor Dube teaches or suggests “a pressurizing plate adapted to interface with the guide block, the pressurizing plate including a pressurizing protrusion on a surface thereof, such that when the pressurizing plate is applied to the guide block, the respective leads of the integrated circuit are urged to directly connect with the corresponding terminals of the upper surface of the test board,” as claimed in amended independent claim 1. In addition, it is submitted that neither Selinko nor Dube teaches or suggests “a first pressurizing plate adapted to interface with at least one of the main body and an upper part of the guide block, the first pressurizing plate including a pressurizing protrusion on a surface thereof, such that when the first pressurizing plate is applied to the at least one of the main body and the guide block, the integrated circuit abuts the test board and the respective leads of the integrated circuit are urged to directly connect with the corresponding terminals of the upper surface of the test board,” as claimed in amended independent claim 8. In addition, it is submitted that neither Selinko nor Dube teaches or suggests “a guide member in the shape of a vertical protrusion or flute adapted to mate with the vertical flute or protrusion of the inner side wall of the guide block, for aligning the integrated circuit relative to the guide block,” as claimed in amended independent claim 13.

Since neither Selinko nor Dube fails to teach or suggest these claimed features set forth above in the amended claims, there is no way to combine the references to obtain such teaching or suggestion of the claimed features, and therefore, there is no combination of the references that teaches or suggests the invention set forth in the amended claims.

Since Selinko and Dube, taken alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest the present invention set forth in the amended claims, claims 1-5, 8, and 10-13 are believed to be allowable over the cited references. Accordingly, reconsideration of the rejections of claims 1-5, 8, and 10-13 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) based on Selinko and Dube is respectfully requested.

Closing Remarks

In view of the amendments to the claims and the foregoing remarks, it is submitted that all claims pending in the application are in condition for allowance, and such allowance is respectfully requested. If prosecution of the application can be expedited by a telephone conference, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned at the number given below.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: April 27, 2005

Mills & Onello, LLP  
Eleven Beacon Street, Suite 605  
Boston, MA 02108  
Telephone: (617) 994-4900, Ext. 4902  
Facsimile: (617) 742-7774



Anthony P. Onello, Jr.  
Registration Number 38,572  
Attorney for Applicant

J:\SAM\0535\amenda\amendmenta.wpd